

III. Remarks

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, and claims 2-7 and 9-14 have been maintained in their previous form.

A. Discussion of Amended Independent Claims

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,355,474 to Thuraishnham et al. These rejections are moot, as claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Claims 1 and 8 were amended to clarify the meaning of the claim terms “requested levels” and “security levels.” Thuraishnham neither teaches or suggests “receiving a request from a requestor, said request associated with a plurality of request levels of a corresponding plurality of dimensions, the request levels being levels of dimensional hierarchies; and comparing each of the plurality of request levels with each of a corresponding set of security levels, the security levels restricting the levels of each dimensional hierarchy to which the requestor is permitted access.”

In rejecting claims 1 and 8, the Examiner points to col. 4, lines 29-52 of Thuraishnham, which describes establishing security levels in connection with performing update requests. In establishing these security levels, Thuraishnham discloses the retrieval of security constraints, which are analyzed in determining the level of security to apply to the relation being updated. Thuraishnham goes on to state that “[w]hen constraints are processed during the update operation, the update processor will compute the security levels of the data being updated and ensure that the data is stored at the appropriate level.” *Thuraishnham, col. 4, lines 45-48*. Thus, security levels are assigned to collections of data, such as update request data, without regard to levels of dimensional hierarchies. In fact, Thuraishnham’s security level descriptions – “unclassified,” “secret,” and “top secret” – clearly support this understanding of Thuraishnham’s teachings by defining security levels in terms of secrecy rather than dimensional hierarchies. *See, for example, Thuraishnham, col. 10, lines 59-68*.

Claims 1 and 8, as amended, are clearly directed to security levels being tied to dimensional hierarchies in a dimensional database. More particularly, the present application involves defining data in dimensional levels and assigning security levels to hierarchical levels of these dimensions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinct from the teachings of Thuraishingham. As claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, these claims are now in condition for allowance as well.

B. Conclusion

Applicants note that the formal drawings of Figs. 10 and 11 were inadvertently excluded from the set of formal drawings filed on August 24, 2001. Applicants hereby submit the formal drawings for Figs. 10 and 11.

A check is enclosed to accommodate the fees for a one-month extension of time. If any additional fees are required to complete this filing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 13-0480, Attorney Docket No. 68146988.714.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action or the Application in general, Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 14 DECEMBER 2004



Richard V. Wells, Reg. No. 53,757
Baker & McKenzie LLP
Attorney for Applicants
(214) 978-3006 (telephone)
(214) 978-3099 (fax)